A NOMENCLATURAL NOTE ON THE HIMANTANDRACEAE

A. C. SMITH

The family Himantandraceae, proposed by Diels in 1917, is now generally accepted by botanists as a distinct family of the order Ranales, related to the Magnoliaceae. However, there has been disagreement as to the correct name for its single genus, whether *Himantandra F. v. Muell.* or *Galbulimima F. M. Bailey.* In an effort to decide which of these names to use, the literature referring to the group has been searched as thoroughly as possible.

The first mention of a plant referable to the family was in 1887, when F. v. Mueller (in Austral. Jour. Pharm. 2: 4; in Bot. Centralbl. 30: 325) described the species Eupomatia Belgraveana, based on Forbes 759 from New Guinea. The description of the species is adequate, but the only mention of the name Himantandra occurs in the remark that ".. this Eupomatia might subgenerically or perhaps even generically be separated (as Himantandra).." A statement of Mueller's that ".. a description has been prepared for the 9th part of the 'Papuan Plants'" gives a clue to the next mention of the species.

Such mention (F. v. Muell. Pap. Pl. 2: 54. 1890) has apparently been overlooked by subsequent students. Although no description is given, Mueller lists the plant as *Himantandra Belgraveana* and refers to the original place of description of *Eupomatia Belgraveana*, thus expressing his definite opinion that the species is generically distinct from *Eupomatia*.

In 1894 F. M. Bailey (in Queensl. Dept. Agr. Bot. Bull. 9: 5, 1894) described *Galbulimima* as a new genus, placing it in the family Magnoliaceae, tribe Wintereae; a single species, *G. baccata*, based on a specimen from Queensland, was proposed. Both genus and species are adequately described.

In 1912 Diels (in Bot. Jahrb. **49:** 164) presented the first formal description of the genus *Himantandra*, proposing the binomial *H. Belgraveana* (F. v. Muell.) Diels under the impression that this was a new combination. In 1917 Diels (in Bot. Jahrb. **55:** 126–134) proposed the family Himantandraceae, discussing it in detail and making the new combination *H. baccata* (F. M. Bailey) Diels.

In 1915 Sprague (in Hook. Ic. Pl. 31: pl. 3001) had redescribed Bailey's genus and species (Galbulimima baccata), placing the genus in the family Magnoliaceae, tribe Illicieae. In 1922 (in Jour. Bot. 60: 137) he pointed out that Himantandra had not been proposed as a genus by Mueller in 1887. In this it appears that Sprague is correct and that Mueller's original mention of the genus was as a nomen provisorium and did not constitute

valid publication. This conclusion is the opposite of that reached by Diels in 1917.

Neither Diels nor Sprague mentions Mueller's publication of 1890, which appears to validate the name *Himantandra* beyond question and in advance of Bailey's publication of *Galbulimima*. Although Mueller, in 1890, published the combination *Himantandra Belgraveana* without indicating it as the basis of a new monotypic genus, this implication is obvious in his reference to the original place of publication of *Eupomatia Belgraveana*. Thus Mueller has given a reference to an adequate description which may be taken as a *descriptio generico-specifica* and has validated the generic name *Himantandra* (see Internat. Rules of Bot. Nomenclature ed. 3. Art. 43. 1935).

It appears that E. G. Baker and Norman (in Jour. Bot. 61: Suppl. 2. 1923) did not accept Sprague's interpretation, for they proposed two new species in the genus *Himantandra*. Sprague (in Jour. Bot. 61: 200. 1923) promptly reiterated his opinion and transferred the two recent new species to *Galbulimima*.

Thus we have a group of four species for which the eight possible binomials have been used. Since 1923 students of the group have used the name *Himantandra*, but none of them has cited Mueller's paper of 1890 in support of his stand. Without considering this paper, Sprague's interpretation would seem to be correct and the name *Galbulimima* would have to be used, but since this paper exists I conclude that we may definitely accept 1890 as the date of authentic publication of the generic name *Himantandra*.

Following is the synonymy of the group and citation of all the references which I have been able to locate. Whether or not all the species will prove acceptable cannot be stated at present.

- HIMANTANDRACEAE Diels in Bot. Jahrb. 55: 126, 1917; Hutchinson in Kew Bull. 1921: 186, 1921, Fam. Fl. Pl. Dicot. 84, 1926.
- Himantandra F. v. Muell. in Austral. Jour. Pharm. 2: 4, nomen provisorium. 1887, in Bot. Centralbl. 30: 326, nomen provisorium. 1887, Pap. Pl. 2: 54. 1890; Diels in Bot. Jahrb. 49: 164, as Himatandra. 1912, in Bot. Jahrb. 55: 127. 1917.
 - Galbulimima F. M. Bailey in Queensl. Dept. Agr. Bot. Bull. 9: 5. 1894, Queensl. Fl. 1: 19. 1899; Sprague in Hook. Ic. Pl. 31: pl. 3001. 1915, in Jour. Bot. 60: 137. 1922, in Jour. Bot. 61: 200. 1923.
- Himantandra Belgraveana (F. v. Muell.) F. v. Muell. Pap. Pl. 2: 54. 1890;
 Diels in Bot. Jahrb. 49: 165. f. 6, as Himatandra B. 1912; Hall. f. in Arch. Néerl. Sci. Exact. Nat. IIIB. 1: 188. 1912; Diels in Bot. Jahrb. 52: 186. 1915, in Bot. Jahrb. 55: 127. f. 1. 1917; Bak. f. & Norman in Jour. Bot. 61: Suppl. 3. 1923;
 Lane-Poole, Rep. For. Res. Papua 86. 1925; Hutchinson, Fam. Fl. Pl. Dicot. f. 4. 1926; White & Francis in Proc. Roy. Soc. Queensl. 39: 62. 1928.
 - Eupomatia Belgraveana F. v. Muell. in Austral. Jour. Pharm. 2: 4. 1887, in Bot. Centralbl. 30: 325. 1887.
 - Galbulimima Belgraveana Sprague in Jour. Bot. 60: 138. 1922.
- 2. Himantandra baccata (F. M. Bailey) Diels in Bot. Jahrb. 55: 128. 1917.

- Galbulimima baccata F. M. Bailey in Queensl. Dept. Agr. Bot. Bull. 9: 5. 1894. Queensl. Fl. 1: 19, 1899, Compr. Cat. Queensl. Pl. 25. f. 8. 1913; Sprague in Hook. Ic. Pl. 31: pl. 3001. 1915, in Jour. Bot. 60: 138. 1922; Domin in Bibl. Bot. 22 [Heft 89]: 115. 1925.
- 3. Himantandra nitida Bak. f. & Norman in Jour. Bot. 61: Suppl. 2. 1923. Galbulimima nitida Sprague in Jour. Bot. 61: 200. 1923.
- 4. Himantandra parvifolia Bak. f. & Norman in Jour. Bot. 61: Suppl. 2, 1923. Galbulimima parvifolia Sprague in Jour. Bot. 61: 200, 1923.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.